DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 494 EA 013 686

AUTHOR Caldwell, William E.; And Others
TITLE Perceived Job Satisfaction of Secondary School Principals as Related to the Collective Bargaining Process.
PUB DATE 14 Apr 81
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; *Collective Bargaining; Contract Salaries; Fringe Benefits; *Job Satisfaction; *Principals; Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Three related studies sought to determine the overall job satisfaction of secondary school principals and the extent to which such satisfaction is affected by the collective bargaining process. One study was designed to illuminate the current role of principals in teacher-district collective bargaining in Pennsylvania and the relationship between that role and principal satisfaction. The purpose of a second study was to describe the current role of principals in self-interest bargaining. A third study attempted to determine the overall level of satisfaction of secondary principals in Pennsylvania as affected by variables related to collective bargaining. The responses of 532 secondary principals suggest that participation in the bargaining process has a positive effect on role satisfaction for secondary principals in Pennsylvania, that providing information for bargaining prior to its initiation is a preferred managerial activity, and that "at-the-table" bargaining roles decrease principals' satisfaction and may damage their relationships with staff. A slight majority of the respondents reported high overall job satisfaction; thus, the perceived level of dissatisfaction with items related to collective bargaining was not sufficient to undermine overall satisfaction. Finally, respondents favored a formal self-interest bargaining unit as most beneficial for attaining salary and welfare benefits. (Author/WD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED203494

PERCEIVED JOB SATISFACTION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AS RELATED TO THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROCESS

by

William E. Caldwell
The Pennsylvania State University

and

C. Jay Hertzog, East Lebanon County School District
Richard A. Riddle, The Pennsylvania State University
Dean R. Steinhart, Elizabethtown School District

Presentation Paper
American Educational Research Association
April 14, 1981

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. E. Caldwell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Purpose and Design of the Studies

The purpose of this group of three studies was to determine the overall job satisfaction of secondary school principals as related to several aspects of their job responsibilities which are closely aligned with the collective bargaining process. The studies were designed to investigate (1) the principal's role and satisfaction in teacher-district bargaining, (2) the principal's role and satisfaction in self-interest bargaining, and (3) the principal's satisfaction with superior and subordinate relationships in the context of bargaining, and other job aspects related to collective bargaining.

One study was designed to determine the current role of principals in teacher-district collective bargaining in Pennsylvania and the relationships between that role and principal satisfaction: to investigate principal satisfaction with consultant, team, at-the-table, and non-participant bargaining roles and the concomitant relationships with teachers as a result of these roles.

Another study was designed to determine the current role of principals in self-interest bargaining, their interest in the pursuit of salaries and benefits, and the relationship of these activities to the satisfaction of

EA 013 656

principals: to investigate principal satisfaction with formal, informal, and non-existent self-interest bargaining relationships and the results of such roles on salaries and relationships with superiors.

A third study conducted concurrently with the others, was designed to determine the overall level of satisfaction of secondary principals in Pennsylvania and to determine the effect, if any, of several collective bargaining variables and organizational relationships affected by bargaining roles on that satisfaction.

Conceptual Framework

The works of Maslow (1962), Herzberg (1957), Alderfer (1972), and Vroom (1964), have laid a basis for the general classification and ordering of human needs in a hierarchical manner from basic, physiological or caretaker needs to the higher order constructs of self-fulfillment or self-actualization. Their research has also related motivation and need satisfaction such that higher order need fulfillment is of greater importance to professionals. These general theories were used in conjunction with more specific ideas of Locke (1976), and Hoppock (1935), relating to job satisfaction. Particular emphasis in one study was directed toward determining the principal's overall job satisfaction as related to several components of the job which are affected by the bargaining process. Role satisfaction of the principal is believed to be of critical importance to the functioning of an efficient and effective school organization. Researchers have suggested that the conduct of teachers' collective bargaining has had a serious impact on the role satisfaction and effectiveness of the principal.

Principals, like managers in other areas, are also preoccupied with notions about pay, status, achievement, and recognition. These factors as well as relationships with significant others can be influenced by collective

bargaining and thus affect principal satisfaction. Many feel that such relationships have deteriorated in the context of bargaining, eroding the principal's authority and autonomy while still holding him/her accountable for the successful functioning of the school.

While principals have been affected by the bargaining process, there is evidence to show that they are often eliminated from an input position in this important area. Porter and Lawler (1968), and others argue that managers are planners and decision-makers and therefore would need to be involved in activities at the planning and early initiation stage in order to achieve status and satisfaction. Those principals who feel increasing pressures from both sides will seek strategies for the protection of their interests. One avenue for such protection is the establishment of formal or informal procedures for self-interest bargaining. Will this reach for such protectionist measures, however be related to the principal's lack of satisfaction with pay, status, etc.

Much of the prior research has suggested that the affects of bargaining on the principal's working environment was not conducive to enhancing over all job satisfaction.

Based on these considerations, one study was designed to (1) measure the overall level of satisfaction of Pennsylvania's secondary school principals, and (2) determine the relationship between such satisfaction and (a) the principal's participation in teacher-district bargaining, (b) the principal's desire to form self-interest bargaining units, (c) their relationships with superiors, and (d) their salary.

A second study based on the concepts noted as well as Atchison and Hill (1978), was designed to (1) determine the role of principals in teacher-district bargaining, (2) determine the relationship between principal satisfaction and the role of the principal in teacher bargaining, and (3)

determine the relationship between teacher-principal harmony and the role of the principal in teacher bargaining.

The third study was based on the same theoretical framework and was designed to (1) determine the current role of principals in self-interest bargaining in Pennsylvania, (2) determine if a relationship existed between such self-interest bargaining and principal salary satisfaction, and (3) determine if a relationship existed between self-interest bargaining of principals and school district variables such as district size and wealth.

Data Source and Instrumentation

In attempting to comprehensively sample the more than one thousand secondary school principals in Pennsylvania, an endorsement of the project was sought from the Pennsylvania Association of Secondary School Principals. Such support was obtained and resulted in the participation of 439 member principals. A random selection of non-member secondary principals was also obtained to verify that non-member and member attitudes, perceptions, and activities were similar in all respects and no significant differences occurred in such variables being tested. After such tests for similarity were satisfied, a total sample of 532 secondary principals were utilized in respect to the tests of hypotheses.

Hoy and Miskel (1978), suggested that the two most common approaches to studying job satisfaction determinants were: (1) to ask about the job, the satisfaction level, and then relate the two concepts, and (2) to determine personal characteristics, ask about the satisfaction level, and then relate these concepts. An attempt was made to follow both of these approaches in this study. The instrument used for data collection was generated by the investigator and was based primarily upon prior research by Alderfer (1972) and that of Gross, Mason and McEachern (1958). Items on the

instrument were divided into three major areas related to demographic characteristics, specific information pertinent to the principals' participation in the local bargaining process, and the individuals' perceived overall satisfaction with their jobs. Section I of the instrument dealt with demographic information about the principal and his/her school; Section II sought the principal's responses on a five-item Likert scale to statements pertaining to the administrators participation in bargaining; and Section III, which also employed the five-item Likert scale for responses to statements concerning the principal's role satisfaction. Instrument reliability in this study was calculated at .848 for the Guttman Lambda - 3 Index and .831 for the Coefficient of Alpha Index on Section II, and .861 for the Guttman Lambda - 3 Index and .890 for the Coefficient of Alpha Index on Section III.

Since the findings of this research is specific to the three studies conducted, the remainder of this paper will be divided into three appropriate sections.

Section I

The relationship between principal satisfaction and his/her participation in teacher-district bargaining.

Hypotheses

Based on the previously discussed framework four hypotheses were generated.

1. A managerial status role of involvement of principals prior to the start of teacher-district bargaining would maximize principal role satisfaction.

2. An active "table role for principals in teacher-district bargaining would be negatively related to principal satisfaction.
3. An active "table" role for principals in teacher-district bargaining would be perceived by principals as detrimental to their staff relationships.
4. A "consultant" role for principals in teacher-district bargaining would be positively related to principal satisfaction.

Findings

An analysis of the data supported the assumption that participation in the bargaining process will have a positive effect on role satisfaction with bargaining for secondary principals in Pennsylvania. Hypothesis I stated that there would be a significant positive relationship between participation prior to the start of bargaining and role satisfaction with bargaining. A correlation of 0.585, statistically significant beyond the 0.05 level, indicated a positive relationship existed between the variables, and supported Hypothesis I. Hypothesis II suggested a negative relationship between sitting at the bargaining table and satisfaction with bargaining. This hypothesis was supported with a negative correlation of -0.1716, significant beyond the 0.05 level of confidence. Hypothesis III stated that principals who sit at the bargaining table would feel that their bargaining role was detrimental to their faculty relationships. The study data did not support this relationship. The correlation coefficient calculated between the two variables produced a correlation of .0725 at a confidence level of .069 which was not statistically significant. Hypothesis IV stated that principals who were involved in the bargaining process as resource persons, providing input into the bargaining, and receiving information and guidance on contract negotiations until its completion will have a positive relationship with role satisfaction in the

collective bargaining process. A positive correlation was found for each of the variables when correlated with role satisfaction with bargaining. The resource person variable had a correlation coefficient of 0.2845, whereas the input variable had a correlation of 0.5114 and accounted for 26.15 percent of the explained variance in the multiple regression analysis.

Pearson correlation analysis of the demographic data revealed that as the age of principals increased, their participation level in bargaining decreased. Other demographic variables that could be supported statistically with the participation variable were: age, years in education, and district size. In each of these cases, an inverse relationship exists so that as age, years in education, and school district size increases the respondents participation in teacher-district bargaining becomes less of a possibility.

Based on the findings of this research a number of conclusions can be presented:

Conclusion 1: Participation in the bargaining process has a positive effect on principal role satisfaction.

Conclusion 2: Providing input to bargaining, prior to the bargaining process is a preferred managerial activity for principals.

Conclusion 3: At the "table" bargaining roles for principals will decrease principal satisfaction and may damage principal-staff relationships.

Implications

The findings of this study are of importance to educational institutions, the leadership of these institutions, state legislative bodies, and to both parties of a collective bargaining process. (1) The findings support the use of principals in the managerial aspects of bargaining process. More specifically, at the planning stages prior to the start of bargaining and during the bargaining process. Boards of education and superintendents should provide the opportunity for their principals to be involved early in the bargaining process. This participation will provide a satisfying role for the

principal and allow him/her the opportunity to function in a managerial mode. With principals across the state and nation seeking affiliation with unions, these findings could become a vehicle of increased communication between boards, superintendents, and principals. Such an increase in communications could open other avenues of interaction that would allow principals to feel involved as managers, with an opportunity for meaningful input to an important educational issue. From the legislative standpoint, this involvement could reduce tension and pressure from within the institutions that produce increased political efforts on the part of principals to become part of the unions of the district. (2) The attitudes of persons who are seen as significant others in the principal's work place should change as a result of this research effort. Individuals who seek out management positions in the schools, need to feel involved in the managerial processes. In addition they need to feel that their input is sought after by persons at the district office or board level. Principals who have opportunities to provide meaningful input to the basic problems and activities of the school district will feel self-actualized and more satisfied with their role as managers. The fact that significant others seek the input of principals prior to the start of bargaining demonstrates that individuals at higher levels of the organization value their input. They should not be asked after the fact, or when bargaining has run into difficulties at the table. (3) Principals should not be asked to sit at the bargaining table as negotiators. This role is not acceptable to most principals and will not produce positive results in the basic managerial aspects of working with staff on a daily basis.

By involving personnel in the managerial process of the school district many positive results may be accrued for the organization. Persons who feel involved as managers will tend to be more satisfied with their

role and will feel that opportunities exist for professional growth and self-actualization. Such activity should reduce the conflict that exists today among Pennsylvania principals who are attempting to obtain bargaining rights from the state legislature.

Section II

The relationship between principal satisfaction and certain variables relating to the collective bargaining process.

Hypotheses

Based on the previously discussed framework, four hypotheses were generated.

1. There will be a positive relationship between principal satisfaction and his/her perception of an equitable salary.
2. The principal's satisfaction with his/her role in determining his/her own salary and benefits will be positively related to overall satisfaction.
3. There will be a positive relationship between the principal's role satisfaction in teacher-district bargaining and his/her overall satisfaction.
4. There will be a positive relationship between principal satisfaction and his/her perception of relationships with superiors.

Findings

Although there seemed to be considerable support in the literature to indicate that principals were not satisfied with their jobs, that

proposition was not upheld statistically by this investigation. To the contrary, frequency responses showed that a slight majority (56.2 percent) of the respondents reported high overall job satisfaction. Perhaps even more significant was the low percentage (7.4 percent) of principals who indicated high overall job dissatisfaction. This implies that the level of job dissatisfaction for principals is very similar to that of other personnel within education as previously reported by Hoy and Miskel (1978).

However in analyzing the satisfaction related directly to each of the four variables, there were indications that many principals were dissatisfied with some aspects of their jobs. Specifically, principals were dissatisfied with their roles in determining their own salaries and benefits, they were satisfied with their relationships with top management, and there was no dominant perception regarding satisfaction with salary and participation in bargaining.

In spite of these cited differences, the four study hypotheses were supported by the results of statistical testing which revealed positive correlations ranging from .50 to .57 between overall job satisfaction and each of the four predictor variables. A simple multiple regression analysis showed that the four predictor variables combined to account for about 48 percent of the total variance in the overall job satisfaction variable.

The major overall study conclusion was that the perceived level of dissatisfaction with items related to the bargaining process was not sufficient to undermine overall job satisfaction for a majority of principals.

Implications

The findings of the study analyses have significant implications for top level school management. It is apparent that there is a high number of secondary school principals who are not satisfied with aspects of their jobs

related to the negotiations process. As yet, the degree of dissatisfaction has not been sufficiently strong so as to undermine overall satisfaction for a majority of the respondents. However, it seems likely that the existing nature of bargaining will continue to add more pressures on the principals unless school management makes determined efforts to enhance their status in management and involvement in managerial decision making. Many respondents indicated that they are not satisfied with the way in which their own salaries and benefits are determined and that they do not have adequate participation in the teacher-district negotiations. The implications seem to be obvious, either get the principals more involved or expect them to be increasingly dissatisfied.

Although most principals saw their relations with top management as positive, the fact that over two-thirds of the respondents favored the formation of self-interest bargaining units suggests that they do not feel secure as part of the "management team." The more principals perceive that they are being bypassed or slighted, the greater should be their desire to form such bargaining units. Of interest also was the respondents' satisfaction with their salaries when compared to other principals in their regions, but their dissatisfaction when compared to teachers' salaries in their own districts. Apparently, principals must believe that they are not receiving adequate compensation for their position vis-a-vis the teachers.

Section III

The relationship between principal satisfaction and salaries, salary differences, and self-interest bargaining.

Hypotheses

Based on the previously discussed framework, five hypotheses were generated.

1. An inverse relationship exists between the principal's role satisfaction and his/her desire for self-interest collective bargaining.
2. A positive relationship exists between the input a principal has in determining his/her salary and principal satisfaction.
3. An inverse relationship exists between a principal's interest in self-interest bargaining and his perceived authority.
4. An inverse relationship exists between a principals salary and his/her desire for self-interest bargaining.
5. An inverse relationship exists between the salary differences of the principal and highest paid teachers and principals' interest in self-interest bargaining.

Findings

An analysis of the data indicated that 72.5 percent of the responding principals considered a formal self-interest bargaining unit as the most beneficial and desirous for salary and welfare benefits. This perception of the usefulness of self-interest bargaining is widespread and was favored by principals in both high and low salary ranges. This widespread desire to utilize formal bargaining units for salaries resulted in a lack of significance in regard to hypotheses IV and V. No relationships were found between principal salaries or principal-teacher salary differences and principal desire for self-interest bargaining. Correlations of .06 and .01 were calculated between the variables in the hypotheses.

However the data did support the relationship posited in hypothesis II between principal satisfaction and input into that salary determination. A correlation of .31 was calculated between the variables. This finding is such that principals feel significantly more satisfied when they have an input or consultation in regard to their salary determination. Since input classifications ranged from "no participation" through informal classes to "a formal bargaining unit," this finding supports the notion that all input, including informal vehicles raise satisfaction levels over non-participation roles. Consistent with this finding was the significant relationship confirmed in respect to hypothesis I. A correlation .32 was found between the principals' satisfaction and his/her desire for self-interest bargaining.

The final hypothesis was upheld by the study data in that a significant relationship was found between the principals perceived authority and his/her interest in self-interest bargaining. A correlation coefficient of .21 was calculated between the variables.

Implications

There is no question that secondary school principals in Pennsylvania want a more active role in the determination of their salary and welfare benefits. A majority now either have no participation in such salary determination or an informal/personal input to the superintendent alone. While over 70 percent of these principals now desire formal self-interest vehicles, the remainder still would seek involvement except at a lower or informal level of input.

Boards and superintendents should understand that principal participation in such determination vehicles will increase satisfaction regardless of the actual salary level. Principal salaries and differences between principal-teacher salaries are not indicators of middle management desire

for self-interest bargaining. It appears that a reasonable determination of principal salaries with principal input will significantly increase satisfaction and may even have an affect on self-interest bargaining attitudes.

Districts should also be aware that perceived loss of authority by principals will also be related to an increase in the desire for self-interest bargaining. According to the propositions set forth by Alderfer (1972), the less relatedness needs are satisfied, the more existence needs will be desired. If principals are denied input into professional-personal concerns, and if perceived authority over staff and students is decreased, it only seems reasonable that lower level self-interest and self-protection desires will increase.

Bibliography

Alderfer, Clayton. Existence, Relatedness, and Growth. New York, New York: Free Press, 1972.

Atchison, Thomas J.; and Hill, Winston W. Management Today. New York, New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1978.

Epstein, Benjamin. Principals: An Organized Force for Leadership. Reston, Virginia: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1974.

George, Thomas. "The Principal's Role and Future in Collective Bargaining " In The School Principal and the Law. Edited by Ralph Stern. Topeka, Kansas: NOLPE, 1979.

Gross, Neal; Mason, Ward, S.; and McEachern, Alexander W. Exploration in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role. New York, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Hayford, Stephen L.; and Sinicropi, Anthony V. Collective Bargaining and the Public Sector Supervisor. PERL 54. Chicago, Illinois: International Personnel Management Association, 1976.

Herzberg, Frederick. Job Attitudes: A Review of Research and Opinion. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.

Hoppock, Robert. Job Satisfaction. New York, New York: Harper, 1935.

Hoy, Wayne K.; and Miskel, Cecil. Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice. New York, New York: Random House, 1978.

Locke, Edwin A. "The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction." In Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Edited by Marvin D. Dunnette. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1976.

Maslow, Abraham, H. Toward a Psychology of Being. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, 1962.

Porter, Lyman W.; and Lawler, Edward E. Managerial Attitudes and Performance. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1968.

Vroom, Victor H. Work and Motivation. New York, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.